REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This Amendment is in response to the Final Office Action dated January 11, 2011.

Claims 1-2, 5-19, 22-36, and 39-54 were pending in the present application. Claims 1, 18, and 35 are amended by this Amendment. Support for this Amendment can be found generally throughout the original description and particularly at pages 11-15. No new matter has been added. Accordingly, Claims 1-2, 5-19, 22-36, 39-54 are now pending in the present application. Reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of the amendments to the claims and the following remarks.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-2, 5-8, 15-19, 22-25, 32-36, 39-42, 49-54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § l03(a) as being unpatentable over Banning et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,421,008 (hereinafter, "Banning") in view of "Kaleidoquery: A Visual Query Language for Object Databases" ("Murray") .

Independent claims 1, 18, and 35

Applicant respectfully disagrees and respectfully traverses the rejection. Applicant submits Banning and Murray do not, alone or in combination, disclose, teach or suggest, "means for resolving column references and value expression datatypes in the query statement; and means responsive to selection of the two or more predicates for visually indicating the grouping in the first display area, wherein the means for indicating the grouping further comprises one or more of the group comprising: indenting the grouped predicates relative to other predicates of the search condition; positioning the grouped predicates adjacent to each other; and delineating the group with parenthesis or an equivalent symbol, wherein an order in which the group is evaluated is controlled in a designated manner" as recited in Independent Claims 1, 18, and 35.

Banning discloses a method, system, and program providing graphical queries and direct manipulations of a database [Abstract, lines 1-3]. More specifically, Banning has the ability to turn various modes on and off (including the group mode, during which all other modes

become disabled if invoked) [Banning, Col. 31, lines 50-51]. Figure 19 displays the ability to change modes, reset modes, and invoke the Group mode. However, there is no teaching or suggestion of "resolving column references and value expression datatypes in a query statement" or "wherein an order in which the group is evaluated is controlled in a designated manner" as found in the recited invention.

Examiner cited Murray implicitly teaches, "wherein an order in which the group is evaluated is controlled in a designated manner" [08.24.10 Office Action Page 7]. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Murray discloses, "The results of the query can then be annotated with numbers showing the order in which they are to be sorted." [*Emphasis added* -- Murray, page 252, para. 54: *ordering the results,* lines 9-11] Applicant contends that although Murray utilizes a sorting operator to be applied to the results of the query, there is no teaching or suggestion of evaluating the group in a controlled designated manner as found in the recited invention.

Applicant further submits that the combination of Banning and Murray references produce a method, system, and program for providing graphical queries and direct manipulations of a database wherein a sorting function displays the order in which the query is to be sorted. Therefore, Banning and Murray do not individually or collectively teach or suggest, "means for resolving column references and value expression datatypes in the query statement; and means responsive to selection of the two or more predicates for visually indicating the grouping in the first display area, wherein the means for indicating the grouping further comprises one or more of the group comprising: indenting the grouped predicates relative to other predicates of the search condition; positioning the grouped predicates adjacent to each other; and delineating the group with parenthesis or an equivalent symbol, wherein an order in which the group is evaluated is controlled in a designated manner". These features in cooperation with the other elements of Claims 1, 18, and 35 are not disclosed by either Banning or Murray either singly or in combination. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits Claims 1, 18, and 35 are allowable.

Dependent claims 2, 5-19, 22-36, and 39-54

Claims 2, 5-19, 22-36, and 39-54 are dependent on independent claims 1, 18, and 35. As discussed above, the independent claims 1, 18, and 35 are allowable over the combination of the references. Accordingly, the above-articulated arguments related to amended independent claims 1, 18, and 35 apply with equal merit to claims 2, 5-19, 22-36, and 39-54. Therefore, claims 2, 5-19, 22-36, and 39-54 are allowable over the combination of the references for at least the same reasons as claims 1, 18, and 35, and are also allowable on their own individual merit. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of claims 2, 5-19, 22-36, and 39-54.

Claims 9-14, 26-31, and 43-48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § l03(a) as being unpatentable over Banning in view of Murray, and further in view of Goldberg et al., U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0004911 A1 (hereinafter, Goldberg).

Dependent claims 9-14, 26-31, and 43-48

Claims 9-14, 26-31, and 43-48 are dependent on independent claims 1, 18, and 35 respectively. As discussed above, independent claims 1, 18, and 35 are allowable over the teachings of Banning and Murray. Accordingly, claims 9-14, 26-31, and 43-48 are also allowable as being dependent upon allowable base claims. Accordingly, the above-articulated arguments related to amended independent claims 1, 18, and 35 apply with equal merit to claims 9-14, 26-31, and 43-48, which are thus allowable over the combination of the references for at least the same reasons as claims 1, 18 and 35 and are also allowable on their own individual merit.

CONCLUSION

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of all pending Claims 1-2, 5-19, 22-36, 39-54 as they are newly amended and presented. Applicants' attorney believes this application is in condition for allowance. Should any unresolved issues remain, Examiner is invited to call Applicants' attorney at the telephone number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,
SAWYER LAW GROUP PC

March 9, 2011   /Renee R Reid/
    Date   Renee R Reid
                                                 Reg. No. 52,159

Customer Number 45728
(650) 493-4540
(650) 493-4549